A theoretical analysis of the super-resolution capacity of imagers using speckle illuminations

December 22, 2015 - Jérôme Idier, *Member, IEEE*, Simon Labouesse, Penghuan Liu, Marc Allain, Sébastien Bourguignon, and Anne Sentenac, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1512.06260v1 [physics.data-an] 19 Dec 2015

Abstract

Speckle based imaging consists in forming a super-resolved reconstruction of an unknown object from low-resolution images obtained under random inhomogeneous illuminations (speckles). However, the origin of this super-resolution is unclear. In this work, we demonstrate that, under physically realistic conditions, the correlation of the data have a super-resolution power corresponding to the squaring of the imager point spread function. This theoretical result is important for many practical imaging systems such as acoustic and electromagnetic tomographies, fluorescence and photoacoustic microscopies or synthetic aperture radar imaging.

Index Terms

Multi-illumination imaging, High-resolution, Cutoff frequency, Second-order statistics, Optical microscopy, photoacoustic imaging, Synthetic aperture radar

I. Introduction

In most active wave imaging systems, the recorded data z can be modeled as the convolution with a point spread function (PSF) h of the product of the object ρ with an illumination E plus some additive noise ε:

$$z = h \star (\rho E) + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

The authors acknowledge partial financial support for this paper from the GdR 720 ISIS.

J. Idier, P. Liu and S. Bourguignon are with L'UNAM Université, Ecole Centrale Nantes and the CNRS at the Institut de Recherche en Communications and Cybernétique de Nantes (IRCCyN, CNRS UMR 6597), 1 rue de la Noë, BP 92101,F-44321 Nantes, France. Tel: (+33)-2 40 37 69 09, Fax: (+33)-2 40 37 69 30.E-mail: firstname.name@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr.

S. Labouesse, M. Allain and A. Sentenac are with Institut Fresnel (CNRS UMR 7249), Université Aix-Marseille, Campus de St Jérôme, F-13013 Marseille, France. E-mail: firstname.name@fresnel.fr.

where $\star$ stands for the convolution operator, either in two or three spatial dimensions. This simple model applies to imaging configurations as diverse as microwave scanners or anechoic chambers [1], radar remote sensing [2] or fluorescence microscopy [3]. The point spread function h contains the information on the imager geometry such as the numerical aperture (NA) of the microscope objective or the size of the antenna array in radar imaging and it accounts for the wave propagation from the object to the detector. In most configurations, the free-space propagation prevents the wavefield high frequencies to reach the detector. As a result, h has necessarily a bounded Fourier support $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$. For instance, in a microwave scanner, $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ is a sphere of radius $1/\lambda$ (where λ is the illumination wavelength) when the field scattered by the object is recorded under all possible directions, or a cap of sphere when the observation is performed only over a small solid angle [4]. Similarly, in two (or three) dimensional fluorescence microscopy, $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ is a disk (or a tore) of radius NA$/\lambda$ [3].

When the illumination is homogeneous throughout the target, sole the object frequencies in $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ can be restored from the data, which limits fundamentally the image resolution. To improve the latter, synthetic imaging using multiple illuminations has been developed. Its main principle is to use several inhomogeneous illuminations $E_m, m = 1, \ldots, M$, to probe the sample. The frequency mixing of E_m with ρ results in a down-modulation of the object high spatial frequencies into the frequency-support $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ of the point spread function. Using an appropriate data processing, object frequencies beyond $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ can be recovered, yielding a much better resolution. This idea is at the core of many imaging configurations such as Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) [2], diffraction tomography [5], and Structured Illumination fluorescence Microscopy (SIM) [6], among others.

In all these techniques, the numerical or analogical process that forms the super-resolved image from the stack of low resolution data requires the knowledge, and thus the control, of the different illuminations. This is a major constraint for the experimental implementation and in some cases proves impossible. Hence, some groups have developed reconstruction algorithms able to handle some imprecision on the illuminations [7]–[10]. Following a more radical option, others have advocated the use of totally uncontrolled illuminations of speckle type [11]. This recent approach, which simplifies dramatically the experimentation, has been already implemented in optical microscopy [12]–[14] and photoacoustic imaging [15]. Using inversion schemes taking advantage of information on the illumination statistics and/or on the sample itself, the stack of low resolution speckle data yielded images with a significantly better resolution than that provided by a standard imager using homogeneous illumination [12]–[14]. However, many questions remain unanswered about the theoretical resolution that one can expect from such a system, in particular with respect to the speckle statistics.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper provides the first comprehensive mathematical understanding of the super-resolution capacity of synthetic imaging using speckle illuminations. Our analysis is very general and basically holds as soon as the data can be modeled by Eq. (1) with $\rho \geq 0$. In particular, it applies to microwave, acoustic or holography imaging, where the data, the illuminations and the PSF are complex values, as well as to fluorescence microscopy, where all spatial quantities take real (nonnegative) values. In what follows, we will consider the complex-valued setting, since the real-setting can be deduced straightforwardly as a particular case where the imaginary parts of the relevant quantities vanish.

We consider M images $(\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_M)$ of the same object that have been acquired using M different speckle illuminations. Each image $\boldsymbol{z}_m = (z_m(\boldsymbol{r}_1), \ldots, z_m(\boldsymbol{r}_N))$ is a set of N pixels, each of which being indexed by a spatial coordinate vector $\boldsymbol{r}_n$. In practice, vector $\boldsymbol{r}_n$ spans a finite d-dimensional rectangular grid $\mathcal{G}$, common to all images, d being equal to two or three. By convention, we consider here that $\boldsymbol{z}_m$ are column vectors (obtained by scanning the image grid in an arbitrary order). The observation model reads

$$z_m(\boldsymbol{r}) = y_m(\boldsymbol{r}) + \varepsilon_m(\boldsymbol{r}) \tag{2}$$

for all $m = 1 \ldots M$ and $\boldsymbol{r} \in \mathcal{G}$, with

$$y_m(\boldsymbol{r}) = \int h(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}')\rho(\boldsymbol{r}')E_m(\boldsymbol{r}')\, d\boldsymbol{r}', \tag{3}$$

where E_m and ε_m are random quantities: E_m is the mth speckle illumination and ε_m stands for electronic noise. The following assumptions are considered:

- (i) The PSF h is of finite energy, *i.e.*, $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$, and it is a nonnegative definite function. Its Fourier transform takes finite (nonnegative) values and vanishes outside a closed set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}} = \{\boldsymbol{u} \mid \widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u}) > 0\}$. The latter assumption is met as soon as the measurement $\boldsymbol{z}_m$ is obtained in the far-field domain which is the case of most imaging systems [4].
- (ii) The object ρ takes finite, nonnegative values within a closed and bounded domain $\mathcal{F}$, and vanishing outside $\mathcal{F}$. The fact that we do not consider complex-valued objects slightly restricts the validity domain of the present study. In particular, in electromagnetic tomography, we can only consider objects with permittivity values that are either real positive (lossless dielectric objects) or imaginary (absorptive objects).
- (iii) The noise and illuminations are second-order stationary, mutually decorrelated random processes. This is a standard hypothesis which is verified for most imagers. Without loss of generality, we will also assume that the noise is centered.

(iv) The first two moments of the illuminations are known. This fundamental assumption is at the core of our approach. It is expected to be less difficult to satisfy than the knowledge of the illuminations themselves.

In this work, we restrict the analysis of the data by considering only second-order statistics. Our aim is to determine the spatial frequency domain over which the object spectrum can be identified from the first and second moment of the data. More precisely, we consider estimators $\widehat{\rho}$ of the object under the form $\widehat{\rho}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_z, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_z)$ where

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_z = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{z}_m \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_z = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{z}_m \boldsymbol{z}_m^{\dagger} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_z \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_z^{\dagger}$$

are respectively the empirical mean vector and the covariance matrix of the data (the symbol '$\dagger$' stands for the transpose conjugate operator). Such methods, hereafter called second-order methods, are interesting for several reasons.

On the one hand, the empirical mean and covariance are easily accessible statistical quantities, that can provide reliable second-order information from a practically acceptable number of illuminations. Moreover, there is hope that they provide fairly simple estimation procedures, with an affordable computational cost for realistic size imaging problems.

On the other hand, the statistical mean and covariance are exhaustive statistics if the data is Gaussian, whether it is real-valued or complex circular. For instance, the latter assumption is suited to most coherent imaging techniques such as electromagnetic tomography, acoustic tomography, and radar imaging. In other situations, such as optical fluorescence microscopy, the speckle illumination, and hence the data, are nongaussian. However, the statistical mean and covariance still provide the whole second-order information in the real-valued case (as encountered in optical microscopy), and in cases where the data is *proper* complex[1]. Finally, in the case where the data would be improper complex, the covariance would not fully describe the second-order statistics, so the proposed study would only provide a lower bound on the information retrievable from the full second-order statistics.

In order to characterize the super-resolution potential of second-order methods, we wish to assign each component of the spatial Fourier transform $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u})$ of the imaged object (hereinafter, the tilde sign '$\widetilde{\ }$' denotes the spatial Fourier transform) to one of the three classes:

- *Non-identifiable* components are those for which the second-order data statistics bring no information.

[1]In the general case, second-order properties of a complex random process $z(\boldsymbol{r})$ are fully characterized by the usual correlation function and the pseudo-correlation function By definition, $z(\boldsymbol{r})$ is *proper* if the pseudo-correlation vanishes $\forall(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}')$ [16].

- *Partially identifiable* components are those for which the second-order data statistics bring some information, but for which some ambiguity remains.
- *Identifiable* spectral components are those which are uniquely determined given the second-order data statistics.

Obviously, these domains may depend on the frequency support $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$ and on the correlation structure of the speckle illumination.

Section II introduces precise notations and establishes expressions for the first two moments of the observed images as functions of the object of interest ρ. Sections III and IV examine the dependency between the latter expressions and the spatial frequency components of the object, in the case of uncorrelated and correlated speckles, respectively. The main mathematical result is obtained in the latter case. It is stated as Property IV and the proof is found in Appendix. Finally, Section V discusses the practical consequences of the obtained results, and evokes possible extensions and remaining points to address.

II. First and second-order characteristics of the data

For simplicity reasons, the discrete, finite character of the data grid $\mathcal{G}$ will be neglected, which amounts to consider that it can be made arbitrary large and tight enough to reach a lossless regime. On the one hand, the PSF h being frequency-limited to the bounded support $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, Parzen's multidimensional extension of Shannon theorem ensures that the ideal sampling of functions y_m is possible [17]. The same holds for z_m, or at least for a filtered version of z_m, where the pure noise components outside $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$ are disregarded. On the other hand, h has a non limited support (since its Fourier transform is of limited support), but it vanishes at arbitrary large distance from the origin (since its Fourier transform is sommable).

The statistical mean and correlation of the data are now derived. Let $\mathcal{E}\{E\} = E_0$ and $\gamma_E(\boldsymbol{r}) = \mathcal{E}\{E(\boldsymbol{x})E^*(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{r})\} - |E_0|^2$ denote the mean and correlation function of the speckle, and let $\gamma_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{r}) = \mathcal{E}\{\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x})\varepsilon^*(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{r})\}$ denote the correlation function of the noise.

A. First-order information content

From the observation model (2)-(3), we deduce the statistical mean $\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r}) = \mathcal{E}\{z_m(\boldsymbol{r})\}$:

$$\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r}) = E_0 \int h(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}')\rho(\boldsymbol{r}')\,d\boldsymbol{r}' \tag{4}$$

whose Fourier transform reads:

$$\widetilde{\mu}_z(\boldsymbol{u}) = E_0\,\widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u}). \tag{5}$$

A straightforward deduction from expression (5) is that any spectral component of ρ belonging to the support $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$ is identifiable, provided that $E_0 \neq 0$. In particular, if $E_m(\boldsymbol{r})$ is a complex circular Gaussian process, we get $E_0 = 0$ [11] and $\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r})$ brings no information about the unknown sample. This conclusion leads to the following property.

Property 1 *The frequency components $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is identifiable from $\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r})$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with*

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}} & \text{if } E_0 \neq 0, \\ \varnothing & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In any case, the first-order does not convey any information on the spectral components outside $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, *i.e.*, it brings no super-resolution capacity.

B. Second-order information content

Now let us focus on the data correlation function

$$\gamma_z(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}') = \mathcal{E}\left\{z_m(\boldsymbol{r}) z_m^*(\boldsymbol{r}')\right\} - \mu_z(\boldsymbol{r})\, \mu_z^*(\boldsymbol{r}')$$

that reads in our context

$$\gamma_z(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}') = \gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}') + \gamma_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}') \tag{6}$$

with, from (3):

$$\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}') = \iint \rho(\boldsymbol{x})\rho(\boldsymbol{x}')\, h(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{x}) h^*(\boldsymbol{r}' - \boldsymbol{x}')\, \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\, d\boldsymbol{x}\, d\boldsymbol{x}'. \tag{7}$$

Since γ_ε contains no information on the quantity of interest, let us focus on $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}')$: using a double Fourier transform on (7), we obtain

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') = \widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u})\, \widetilde{h}(-\boldsymbol{u}') \iint e^{-2i\pi(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}'\cdot\boldsymbol{x}')} \rho(\boldsymbol{x})\rho(\boldsymbol{x}')\gamma_E(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\, d\boldsymbol{x}\, d\boldsymbol{x}' \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}$ denotes the usual scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Given that

$$\gamma_E(\boldsymbol{x}' - \boldsymbol{x}) = \int e^{2i\pi(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\cdot\boldsymbol{u}''} \widetilde{\gamma}_E(\boldsymbol{u}'')\, d\boldsymbol{u}'',$$

it is easy to express $\widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}')$ as follows:

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') = \widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u})\, \widetilde{h}(-\boldsymbol{u}')\, \widetilde{g}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}'), \tag{9}$$

with

$$\widetilde{g}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') = \int \widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'')\, \widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u}' + \boldsymbol{u}'')\, \widetilde{\gamma}_E(\boldsymbol{u}'')\, d\boldsymbol{u}''. \tag{10}$$

From the correlation γ_y (7), or from its spectral decomposition (9), we deduce that the spectral density $\widetilde{\gamma}_E$ plays a central role in the identification of the spectral components of the sample. Let us investigate first the case of spatially uncorrelated speckle.

III. Case of uncorrelated speckle

Let us assume that $\gamma_E(\boldsymbol{r}) = \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})\delta(\boldsymbol{r})$. This assumption can be considered valid when the speckle correlation typical size is much smaller than that of the point spread function. Then (7) becomes

$$\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}') = \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0}) \int \rho^2(\boldsymbol{x})\, h(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{x}) h^*(\boldsymbol{r}'-\boldsymbol{x})\; d\boldsymbol{x}. \tag{11}$$

In the Fourier domain, $\widetilde{\gamma}_E(\boldsymbol{u}) = \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})$, so (10) and (9) read

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}') &= \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})\widetilde{\rho^2}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{u}'), \\ \widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}') &= \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})\widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u})\,\widetilde{h}(-\boldsymbol{u}')\,\widetilde{\rho^2}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{u}'), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

respectively. The latter relation is important since it yields that ρ^2 is accessible over all frequencies $\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{u}'$ such that both $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $-\boldsymbol{u}'$ belong to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, *i.e.,* over the set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, where $\ominus$ denotes the Minkowski difference between sets. As a conclusion, the following property holds.

Property 2 *The frequency component $\widetilde{\rho^2}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is identifiable from the correlation function $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$.*

An equivalent (and useful) formulation of $\mathcal{D}_2$ is

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \{\boldsymbol{u} \mid \gamma_{\widetilde{h}}(\boldsymbol{u}) > 0\} \tag{13}$$

where $\gamma_{\widetilde{h}}$ is the (deterministic) autocorrelation function of $\widetilde{h}$. Hence, if $\widetilde{h}$ is a disk of radius ν_{PSF} (*e.g.,* $\widetilde{h}$ is the two-dimensional optical transfer function in fluorescence microscopy), we get $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ with $\mathcal{D}_2$ a disk of radius $2\nu_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, so the super-resolution factor on ρ^2 equals two. Another remarkable fact is that Property 2 still holds if only $v(\boldsymbol{r}) = \gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r})$ is considered instead of the full correlation sequence $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')$. The starting point is the following identity, which is an immediate consequence of (11):

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})\,(\rho^2 \star |h|^2)(\boldsymbol{r}), \tag{14}$$

i.e., in the Fourier domain:

$$\int v(\boldsymbol{r})\, e^{-2i\pi \boldsymbol{r}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}\, d\boldsymbol{r} = \gamma_E(\boldsymbol{0})\,(\gamma_{\widetilde{h}} \times \widetilde{\rho^2})(\boldsymbol{u})$$

Since $\widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u}) > 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{PSF}}$, it is clear that the support of $\mathcal{D}_2$ is again given by (13).

Property 3 *The frequency component $\widetilde{\rho^2}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is identifiable from the autocorrelation function $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r})$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_2$.*

In [14], a similar conclusion was obtained in a simplified imaging configuration made of point-like objects.

It is worth noting that the identifiability of $\widetilde{\rho^2}$ over a certain spectral domain predjuges in no way that of $\widetilde{\rho}$ (despite the positivity of ρ). Indeed, on the one hand, the data correlation contains information on arbitrarily high frequency components of the object, since the spectrum of ρ^2 is the autoconvolution of the spectrum of ρ. On the other hand, no high frequency component of the object is perfectly identifiable, even for objects whose frequency support would be included in $\mathcal{D}_2$. Let us consider an imaging configuration where $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ is a disk of radius $\nu_{\rm PSF}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_2$ is a disk of radius $2\nu_{\rm PSF}$. We define the object $\rho(\boldsymbol{r}) = 1+\cos\theta$ with $\theta = 2\pi\boldsymbol{\nu}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}$ such that $\nu_{\rm PSF} \leq \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\| \leq 2\nu_{\rm PSF}$. Then $\rho^2(\boldsymbol{r})$ is equal to $3/2+2\cos\theta+1/2\cos 2\theta$ and only the first two terms belong to $\mathcal{D}_2$. Hence, no second-order method can discriminate ρ from other objects ρ' such that $(\rho')^2$ would have the same spectrum as ρ^2 within $\mathcal{D}_2$. For instance, one can easily check that $\rho'(\boldsymbol{r}) = (1+2\cos\theta)/\sqrt{2}$ is one of such objects, moreover it has also a spectrum limited to $\mathcal{D}_2$.

As a conclusion, except the spectral components of ρ belonging to $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ that may be directly identifiable from the mean of the data (see Prop. 1), the other spectral components of ρ are only partially identifiable. Here, a difficulty to analyse the super-resolution capacity of second-order methods corresponds to the fact that the data correlation is a quadratic functional of the unknown object ρ, hence it does not lend itself to a spectral decomposition, in contrast with a linear functional of ρ.

IV. Case of correlated speckle

Let us now assume that the speckle illuminations are spatially correlated, with a frequency support restricted to a frequency domain $\mathcal{D}_{\rm spec}$. According to expression (9), $\widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}')$ vanishes when either $\boldsymbol{u}$ or $-\boldsymbol{u}'$ is outside $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$. On the other hand, according to (10), $\widetilde{g}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}')$ conveys no information on the frequency components $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{v})$ such that either $\boldsymbol{v}\pm\boldsymbol{u}$ or $\boldsymbol{v}\pm\boldsymbol{u}'$ falls outside $\mathcal{D}_{\rm spec}$. We conclude that the following property holds.

Property 4 *Any spectral component $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u})$ with $\boldsymbol{u} \notin \mathcal{D}_1 \cup (\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\rm spec})$ is non-identifiable from the mean $\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r})$ and the correlation function $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')$.*

The latter property is a negative one. Fortunately, a positive partial converse can be established in the important situation where the frequency support of the illuminations is not larger than that of the PSF. The following non trivial property holds. Its proof is reported in Appendix A.

Property 5 *Provided that γ_E is such that $\mathcal{D}_{\rm spec} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$, any spectral component $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is identifiable from the mean $\mu_z(\boldsymbol{r})$ and the correlation function $\gamma_y(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2'$ with $\mathcal{D}_2' = \mathcal{D}_{\rm spec} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\rm spec}$.*

In the case where $\mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\rm spec}$ are centered disks of respective radii $\nu_{\rm PSF}$ and $\nu_{\rm spec}$ (as in two-dimensional fluorescence microscopy), $\mathcal{D}_2'$ is a centered disk of radius $2\nu_{\rm spec}$. As a consequence, if $E_0 \neq 0$, we get $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2'$ if $\nu_{\rm spec} > \nu_{\rm PSF}/2$, leading to a super-resolution factor of $2\nu_{\rm spec}/\nu_{\rm PSF}$.

In the extreme case where $\mathcal{D}_{\rm spec} = \mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$, which is encountered each time the illuminations and observations are performed via the same components (same antennas array for the emission and detection, same microscope objective for the illumination and collection), the latter two properties allow us to reach a tight conclusion: second-order data statistics are sufficient to identify all the frequency components of the object within $\mathcal{D}_2' \equiv \mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\rm PSF}$, and bring no information outside. In other words, they should permit to recover the object with a resolution equivalent to that of $|h|^2$.

V. Conclusion and perspectives

We have mathematically demonstrated that the mean and correlation function of low resolution images obtained with random illuminations permit to recover a super-resolved image of the sample, provided the first two statistical moments of the illuminations are known. Since this condition is expected to be less stringent to meet than the knowledge of each illumination, we believe that this result can be interesting in many practical situations. Hence, in photoacoustic imaging using speckle illuminations, the autocorrelation of the random optical intensity can drop to a few hundreds of nanometers while the acoustic PSF h has a typical width of tens of microns. Hence, from the acoustic point of view, the illumination can be seen as an uncorrelated random process [15], which is the case studied in Section III. Thus, using optical speckle in a photoacoustic experiment would allow to retrieve the square of the optical absorption density with an ameliorated PSF $h_{\rm ext} = |h|^2$.

In fluorescence microscopy, if the speckle is generated through the same objective as that used to collect the light, its autocorrelation will be exactly equal to the microscope PSF and results of Section IV apply. We believe that this is a particularly important result. Indeed, it shows that speckle microscopy has the potential to generate a super-resolved PSF $h_{\rm ext} = |h|^2$. In other words, the super-resolution would be equivalent to that of a perfect confocal microscope with infinitively small pinhole [18], but it would be obtained with no transverse scanning and with no loss of photons. In holographic imaging, the consequence would be even more spectacular. In these systems, the Fourier support of the PSF h is generally a cap of sphere. As a result, the three-dimensional information on the sample is lost if only one illumination is used. This is clearly observed in digital holography where the reconstruction of a target

from its unique two-dimensional hologram obtained under a monochromatic plane wave illumination is significantly deteriorated along one axis [19]. On the other hand, by processing two-dimensional images obtained under different speckle illuminations, one should be able to reconstruct the target in three dimensions with a PSF comparable to that obtained in tomographic diffraction imaging [4], but without the difficulty and slowness of controlling the angles of illuminations.

Finally, it is important to stress the limits of the present analysis. First, our study relies strictly on the information contained in the data second-order statistics. It does not take into account the potential impact of regularization in the inversion schemes (for instance, exploiting a sparsity prior [13] could yield an additional increase of resolution). Second, there exist many imaging configurations where the data second-order statistics do not define entirely the random process (in particular when the illuminations are positive intensities). In this case, even though our demonstration still holds, it is likely that accounting more precisely for the speckle statistics by adopting a maximum likelihood approach or by exploiting higher images cumulants will ameliorate the resolution. Indeed, for uncorrelated speckles, one can write the following extension of Eq. (14),

$$\mathrm{Cum}_y^n(\boldsymbol{r}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}) = \mathrm{Cum}_E^n(\mathbf{0}, \ldots, \mathbf{0})\,(\rho^n \star |h|^n)(\boldsymbol{r}), \tag{15}$$

where Cum^n denotes the nth circular cumulant of a given random process [20]. Eq. (15) shows directly that the higher-order data statistics yield additional information on the high spatial frequencies of the object. Such a property is reminiscent from the principle of SOFI [21]. Finally, it is to be noted that extracting the object Fourier components from the second-order data statistics is not a trivial issue since the empirical data covariance matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_z$ is huge for realistic image sizes. Thus, work remains to be done on the practical implementation of second-order estimators.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF PROPERTY 5

Let q denote the impulse response of the filter defined in the Fourier domain by

$$\widetilde{q}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \widetilde{\gamma}_E^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) \quad \text{if } \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{spec}}, \quad 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

Akin to γ_E, q is nonnegative definite, and hence it is a Hermitian symmetric function. We have then $\widetilde{\gamma}_E = \widetilde{q}^2$, and hence

$$\gamma_E = q \star q. \tag{16}$$

Let us also define the following kernels:

$$f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}') = \int q(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{x})q^*(\boldsymbol{r}'-\boldsymbol{x})\rho(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x}, \tag{17}$$

$$F(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}') = \int f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}'')f^*(\boldsymbol{r}',\boldsymbol{r}'')\,d\boldsymbol{r}''. \tag{18}$$

and the induced integral operators K_f and K_F:

$$K_f\phi(\boldsymbol{r}) = \int f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')\phi(\boldsymbol{r}')\,d\boldsymbol{r}',$$

$$K_F\phi(\boldsymbol{r}) = \int F(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')\phi(\boldsymbol{r}')\,d\boldsymbol{r}'.$$

According to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\left|f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')\right|^2 \leq \int |q(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{x})|^2\,\rho(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x} \int \left|q(\boldsymbol{r}'-\boldsymbol{x})\right|^2\rho(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\iint \left|f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')\right|^2\,d\boldsymbol{r}\,d\boldsymbol{r}' \leq \left(\int |q(\boldsymbol{r})|^2\,d\boldsymbol{r}\int \rho(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x}\right)^2,$$

where ρ is summable, and

$$\int |q(\boldsymbol{r})|^2\,d\boldsymbol{r} = \int \widetilde{\gamma}_E(\boldsymbol{u})\,d\boldsymbol{u} = \gamma_E(0) < \infty.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\iint \left|f(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}')\right|^2\,d\boldsymbol{r}\,d\boldsymbol{r}' < \infty,$$

i.e., $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{C})$, and consequently, K_f is a Hilbert-Schmidt integral operator [22, Proposition 3.4.16]. On the other hand, the integral operator K_F is the square of K_f, in the sense that $K_F\phi = K_fK_f\phi$ for any ϕ. Thus, K_F is also a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Now let us go to the heart of the proof, which is threefold. The first step allows us to show that kernel F is uniquely defined from γ_y. In a second step, we establish that f is uniquely defined from F given (18). At this point, we conclude that the knowledge of γ_y implies that of f, which is a linear functional of ρ (whereas the dependency of γ_y in ρ is quadratic). The last step consists in a Fourier analysis of f, in order to determine which spectral components of ρ are indentifiable from the knowledge of f.

Step 1) Given (17) and (16), we have the following alternate expression for (18):

$$F(\boldsymbol{r},\boldsymbol{r}') = \iint \rho(\boldsymbol{x})\rho(\boldsymbol{x}')\,q(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{x})q^*(\boldsymbol{r}'-\boldsymbol{x}')\,\gamma_E(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}')\,d\boldsymbol{x}\,d\boldsymbol{x}'. \tag{19}$$

Comparing the latter expression to (7), it is clear that $F = \gamma_y$ in the case $q = h$, *i.e.*, when the speckle correlation is $h \star h$. More generally, using a double Fourier transform on (19), in the same way as we obtained (9) from (7), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{F}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') &= \widetilde{q}(\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{q}(-\boldsymbol{u}')\widetilde{g}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') \\
&= \frac{\widetilde{q}(\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{q}(-\boldsymbol{u}')}{\widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{h}(-\boldsymbol{u}')}\widetilde{\gamma}_y(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') && \text{if } \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{spec}}, \qquad (20) \\
&= 0 && \text{otherwise.} \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us remark that $\widetilde{h}(\boldsymbol{u}) \neq 0$ if $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{spec}}$ because we have assumed $\mathcal{D}_{\text{spec}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\text{PSF}}$.

Step 2) Kernel f is obviously symmetric. Moreover, it is nonnegative definite, since for any square integrable function ϕ,

$$\iint f(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{r}')\phi(\boldsymbol{r})\phi^*(\boldsymbol{r}')\, d\boldsymbol{r}\, d\boldsymbol{r}' = \int |q \star \phi|^2(\boldsymbol{x})\rho(\boldsymbol{x})\, d\boldsymbol{x} \geq 0.$$

It is easy to check that kernel F is also nonnegative. Moreover K_F is bounded, since it is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Being bounded and nonnegative, K_F admits a unique square root [22, Prop. 3.2.11]. In other words, K_f is uniquely defined given K_F, and equivalently, given the kernel F, there exists a unique kernel f that fulfills (18).

Finally, the knowledge of γ_y uniquely determines F through (20)-(21), which in turn determines f.

Step 3) Eq. (17) can be written as follows in the Fourier domain:

$$\widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}') = \widetilde{q}(\boldsymbol{u})\, \widetilde{q}(-\boldsymbol{u}')\, \widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}').$$

The latter identity is comparable to (12) obtained in the uncorrelated speckle case. In a much similar way, we deduce that the frequency components $\widetilde{\rho}(\boldsymbol{u})$ are identifiable from kernel f, and thus from the data correlation γ_y, for all $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{spec}} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\text{spec}}$.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Van den Berg and J. Fokkema, "Removal of undesired wavefields related to the casing of a microwave scanner", *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 187–192, 2003.

[2] D. C. Munson, J. O'Brien, and K. W. Jenkins, "A tomographic formulation of spotlight mode synthetic aperture radar", *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 71, pp. 917–925, 1983.

[3] M. G. Gustafsson, L. Shao, P. M. Carlton, C. J. R. Wang, I. N. Golubovskaya, W. Z. Cande, D. A. Agard, and J. W. Sedat, "Three-dimensional resolution doubling in wide-field fluorescence microscopy by structured illumination", *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 94, no. 12, pp. 4957 – 4970, 2008.

[4] O. Haeberlé, K. Belkebir, H. Giovaninni, and A. Sentenac, "Tomographic diffractive microscopy: basics, techniques and perspectives", *Journal of Modern Optics*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 686–699, 2010.

[5] A. J. Devaney, "A filtered backpropagation algorithm for diffraction tomography", *Ultrasonic Imaging*, vol. 4, pp. 336–350, 1982.

[6] M. G. L. Gustafsson, D. A. Agard, and J. W. Sedat, "Doubling the lateral resolution of wide-field fluorescence microscopy using structured illumination", *Proceedings of SPIE*, vol. 3919, pp. 141–150, 2000.

[7] P. Thibault, M. Dierolf, O. Bunk, A. Menzel, and F. Pfeiffer, "Probe retrieval in ptychographic coherent diffractive imaging", *Ultramicroscopy*, vol. 109, no. 4, pp. 338 – 343, 2009.

[8] K. Wicker, O. Mandula, G. Best, R. Fiolka, and R. Heintzmann, "Phase optimisation for structured illumination microscopy", *Optics Express*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 2032–2049, Jan 2013.

[9] R. Ayuk, H. Giovannini, A. Jost, E. Mudry, J. Girard, T. Mangeat, N. Sandeau, R. Heintzmann, K. Wicker, K. Belkebir, and A. Sentenac, "Structured illumination fluorescence microscopy with distorted excitations using a filtered blind-SIM algorithm", *Optics Letters*, vol. 38, no. 22, pp. 4723–4726, Nov 2013.

[10] A. Jost, E. Tolstik, P. Feldmann, K. Wicker, A. Sentenac, and R. Heintzmann, "Optical sectioning and high resolution in single-slice structured illumination microscopy by thick slice Blind-SIM reconstruction", *PLoS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. e0132174, July 2015.

[11] J. W. Goodman, *Statistical Optics*, John Wiley, New York, NY, 1985.

[12] E. Mudry, K. Belkebir, J. Girard, J. Savatier, E. Le Moal, C. Nicoletti, M. Allain, and A. Sentenac, "Structured illumination microscopy using unknown speckle patterns", *Nature Photonics*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 312–315, 2012.

[13] J. Min, J. Jang, D. Keum, S.-W. Ryu, C. Choi, K.-H. Jeong, and J. C. Ye, "Fluorescent microscopy beyond diffraction limits using speckle illumination and joint support recovery", *Scientific Reports*, vol. 3, pp. No 2075, 2013.

[14] J.-E. Oh, Y.-W. Cho, G. Scarcelli, and Y.-H. Kim, "Sub-Rayleigh imaging via speckle illumination", *Optics Letters*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 682–684, Mar 2013.

[15] J. Gateau, T. Chaigne, O. Katz, S. Gigan, and E. Bossi, "Improving visibility in photoacoustic imaging using dynamic speckle illumination", *Optics Letters*, vol. 38, no. 23, pp. 5188–5191, 2013.

[16] F. Neeser and J. Massey, "Proper complex random processes with applications to information theory", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1293–1302, July 1993.

[17] E. Parzen, "A simple proof and some extensions of the sampling theorem", Tech. Rep. 7, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 1956.

[18] S. Kimura and C. Munakata, "Dependence of 3-D optical transfer functions on the pinhole radius in a fluorescent confocal optical microscope", *Applied Optics*, vol. 29, no. 20, pp. 3007–3011, Jul 1990.

[19] B. Simon, M. Debailleul, V. Georges, V. Lauer, and O. Haeberlé, "Tomographic diffractive microscopy of transparent samples", *The European Physical Journal - Applied Physics*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 29–35, 2008.

[20] P. Comon and L. De Lathauwer, "Chapter 9 - Algebraic identification of under-determined mixtures", in *Handbook of Blind Source Separation*, P. Comon and C. Jutten, Eds., pp. 325 – 365. Academic Press, Oxford, 2010.

[21] T. Dertinger, R. Colyer, G. Iyer, S. Weiss, and J. Enderlein, "Fast, background-free, 3D super-resolution optical fluctuation imaging (SOFI)", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 106, no. 52, pp. 22287–22292, 2009.

[22] G. K. Pedersen, *Analysis Now*, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1995.